REMARKS

Claims 1-35 are now pending in the application. Claims 1, 2, 5, and 7-35 are herein amended. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

CLAIM OBJECTIONS

Claims 2, 8-11, 13-24, and 26-35 stand objected to for certain informalities. Claims 2, 8-11, 13-19, 21-24, and 26-35 have been amended to replace the term [comprising] with "further comprising" as suggested by the Examiner. It is noted Claim 20 has been redrafted in independent form, to include the subject matter of Claims 12 and 19, therefore rendering the objection to Claim 20 moot. The Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the objection to Claims 2, 8-11, 13-24, and 26-35.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 8 and 12-35 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 8 has been amended to correct the antecedent basis of "the at least one" Internet service provider. The Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph rejection of Claim 8.

Claims 12 and 25 have been amended to correct the antecedent basis for "the at least one communications link manager". Claims 14, 26, and 29 have also been amended to correspond to amended Claims 12 or 25. The Examiner is respectfully

requested to withdraw the 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph rejection of Claims 12, 14, 25, 26, and 29. Because Claims 13 and 15-19 depend from Claim 12, and because Claims 27, 28, and 30-35 depend from Claim 25, Claims 13, 15-19, 27, 28, and 30-35 should be in condition for allowance. The Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph rejection of Claims 13, 15-19, 27, 28, and 30-35.

Applicants note Claim 20, which has been amended to include the limitations of Claims 12 and 19, has also been amended to correct the antecedent basis for "the at least one communications link manager". Claim 20 and Claims 21-24 which depend from Claim 20 should therefore be in condition for allowance. The Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph rejection of Claims 20-24.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1, 2, 4-9, 11-15 and 17-19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Streemanthula et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2005/0169220) in view of Smith et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0182445). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

CLAIMS 1, 2, 4-6

It is initially noted Claim 1 has been amended to recite in part:

> "a ground based communications link manager communicatively linkable
>
> to a first mobile platform;

an initial destination address assignable to the <u>first</u> mobile platform;

<u>a local prefix number pool operable to store a limited quantity of prefix</u>

<u>numbers each received from any of a plurality of mobile platforms upon</u>

<u>completion of a trip of any of the plurality of mobile platforms; and</u>

a prefix server program operable to <u>select one of the limited quantity of</u>

<u>prefix numbers from the local prefix number pool and</u> communicate the

initial destination address of the <u>first</u> mobile platform to the

communications link manager and to the Internet".

Support for this amendment is found in paragraph [0022] of the specification.

Streemanthula et al. appears to teach "Each MONET 1 where a MR 3 resides is assigned a MONET network prefix (MNP), which is the permanent network prefix assigned in the home link of the MR 3. The MNP is not changed when the MR 3 moves its network attachment from one AR 5 to another". See paragraph [0010] on page 1. Streemanthula et al. further teaches "When the MR 3 changes its attachment point, it reconfigures its CoA using the prefix of the new AR 5 (AR-2).". See paragraph [0011] on page 1.

Streemanthula et al. does not teach or suggest "*a local prefix number pool operable to store a limited quantity of prefix numbers each received from any of a plurality of mobile platforms upon completion of a trip of any of the plurality of mobile platforms*" as recited in amended Claim 1.

Smith et al. appears to teach "a prefix server has a plurality of unassigned address prefixes suitable for use within a given communications network. From time to time, a router will request assignment of a new address prefix to use with a given link.

The prefix server will assign a new address prefix to that requesting router to use with that link as appropriate. In one embodiment, the prefix server will assign a new address prefix by selecting an address prefix from amongst the plurality of unassigned address prefixes that preserves, to at least some extent, a routing aggregation that includes a route to the link for which the new address prefix will be used. In one embodiment, when no such assignment that preserves routing aggregation can be made (notwithstanding a general availability of one or more unassigned address prefixes), the prefix server can refuse to assign a new address prefix. Pursuant to another embodiment, the prefix server can reassign previously assigned address prefixes to thereby make available an address prefix that can be assigned while also preserving a routing aggregation". See paragraph [0014] on page 1.

Smith et al. further teaches "The prefix server 14 comprises a server having stored in local memory (or having access to remotely stored) unassigned address prefixes. These address prefixes preferably comprise either sequentially numbered address prefixes or at least address prefixes having one or more prefixes that share at least some most significant address bits (either as amongst themselves and/or with already assigned address prefixes within the network in question) (certain benefits of these embodiments can be realized without making this provision, but, generally speaking, assignments to support aggregation can be more readily assured by providing such unassigned address prefixes).". See paragraph [0015] of pages1 and 2.

Smith et al. does not teach or suggest "a local prefix number pool operable to store a limited quantity of prefix numbers each received from any of a plurality of mobile

platforms upon completion of a trip of any of the plurality of mobile platforms" as recited in amended Claim 1.

Neither of the references of Streemanthula et al. or Smith et al. alone or in combination teaches or suggests *"a local prefix number pool operable to store a limited quantity of prefix numbers each received from any of a plurality of mobile platforms upon completion of a trip of any of the plurality of mobile platforms"*.

The suggested modification of Streemanthula et al. with Smith et al. therefore cannot render Claim 1 obvious. The Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of Claim 1. Because Claims 2, 4-9, and 11 depend from Claim 1, the suggested modification of Streemanthula et al. with Smith et al. cannot render any of Claims 2, 4-9, or 11 obvious for at least the same reasons. The Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of Claims 2, 4-9, and 11.

CLAIMS 7-9 AND 11

It is initially noted Claim 7 has been amended to recite in part:

> "<u>storing in a local prefix number pool a plurality of prefix numbers</u>
>
> <u>received from any of a plurality of mobile platforms upon completion</u>
>
> <u>of a trip of any of the plurality of mobile platforms;</u>
>
> <u>linking a mobile autonomous system number to the prefix number</u>
>
> <u>operable by the prefix server to aggregate a plurality of routes within the</u>
>
> <u>local prefix number pool.</u>

linking the prefix number <u>with the mobile autonomous system number</u> to a mobile platform identification number; and

linking the prefix number <u>with the mobile autonomous system number</u> to a mobile platform destination address".

Support for this amendment is found in paragraphs [0022] and [0023] of the specification.

For at least the same reasons noted above with respect to Claim 1, neither of the references of Streemanthula et al. or Smith et al. alone or in combination teaches or suggests "*storing in a local prefix number pool a plurality of prefix numbers received from any of a plurality of mobile platforms upon completion of a trip of any of the plurality of mobile platforms*" as recited in amended Claim 7.

Further, neither of the references of Streemanthula et al. or Smith et al. alone or in combination teaches or suggests "*linking a mobile autonomous system number to the prefix number operable by the prefix server to aggregate a plurality of routes within the local prefix number pool*" as recited in amended Claim 7.

The suggested modification of Streemanthula et al. with Smith et al. therefore cannot render amended Claim 7 obvious. The Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of Claim 7. Because Claims 8-9 and 11 depend from Claim 7, the suggested modification of Streemanthula et al. with Smith et al. cannot render any of Claims 8-9 or 11 obvious for at least the same reasons. The Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of Claims 8-9 and 11.

CLAIMS 12-15 and 17-19

It is initially noted Claim 12 has been amended herein to recite in part:

"*storing in an initially empty local prefix number pool a plurality of prefix numbers after use by a plurality of mobile platforms;* and

programming the prefix server to operatively select <u>one of the plurality of prefix numbers</u> for the mobile platform from <u>the local prefix number pool</u>".

Support for this amendment is found in paragraph [0022] of the specification.

For at least the same reasons noted above with respect to Claim 1, neither of the references of Streemanthula et al. or Smith et al. alone or in combination teaches or suggests "*storing in an initially empty local prefix number pool a plurality of prefix numbers after use by a plurality of mobile platforms;* and *programming the prefix server to operatively select one of the plurality of prefix numbers for the mobile platform from the local prefix number pool*" as recited in amended Claim 12.

The suggested modification of Streemanthula et al. with Smith et al. therefore cannot render amended Claim 12 obvious. The Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of Claim 12. Because Claims 13-15 and 17-19 depend from Claim 12, the suggested modification of Streemanthula et al. with Smith et al. cannot render any of Claims 13-15 or 17-19 obvious for at least the same reasons. The Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of Claims 13-15 and 17-19.

Claims 3, 10 and 16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Streemanthula et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2005/0169220) in view of Smith et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0182445 in further view of D'Annunzlo (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0048786). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

In addition to the discussion above with respect to Streemanthula et al. and Smith et al., D'Annunzlo appears to teach use of a unique aircraft identifier to create a communication address, teaching "each aircraft is assigned a unique aircraft identifier (ACID) during initial system installation. The ACID is used to create a unique subnet address that is also assigned to the aircraft during initial system installation. It can further be seen that during takeoffs the ACID is retrieved from an aircraft configuration table 26 based on the tail number. A subnet class is determined for the aircraft and is allocated from an air-to-ground network (AGN) address space (to be described in greater detail below). This enables conversion of the aircraft identifier into the destination subnet address in accordance with the subnet class. <u>Specifically, it can be seen that the ACID is a numerical value that is used to construct an aircraft-unique IP subnet address</u>." See paragraph [0026] on page 2.

D'Annunzlo does not teach or suggest use of a local prefix number pool operable to store a limited quantity of prefix numbers each received from any of a plurality of mobile platforms upon completion of a trip of any of the plurality of mobile platforms.

The suggested modification of Streemanthula et al. with Smith et al. and D'Annunzlo therefore cannot render any of amended Claims 1, 7, or 12 obvious. Because Claim 3 depends from Claim 1, Claim 10 depends from Claim 7, and Claim 16

depends from Claim 12, the suggested modification of Streemanthula et al. with Smith et al. and D'Annunzlo therefore cannot render any of Claims 3, 10, or 16 obvious for at least the same reasons. The Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of Claims 3, 10, and 16.

ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER

The Examiner states that Claims 20-24 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. Accordingly, Applicants have amended Claim 20 to include the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Therefore, Claim 20 should now be in condition for allowance, and Claims 21-24 which depend from Claim 20 should also be in condition for allowance.

The Examiner states that Claims 25-35 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. As noted herein, Applicants have amended Claims 25, 26, and 29 to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. Therefore, Claims 25, 26, and 29, as well as Claims 27-28 and 30-35 which depend from Claim 25 should now be in condition for allowance.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: _April 22, 2008_

By: _____
Thomas J. Krul, Reg. No. 46,842

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

TJK/pml